ON THE QUANTIFIER COMPLEXITY OF DEFINABLE CANONICAL HENSELIAN VALUATIONS

ARNO FEHM AND FRANZISKA JAHNKE

Abstract. We discuss definability in the language of rings without parameters of the unique canonical henselian valuation of a field. We show that in most cases where the canonical henselian valuation is definable, it is already definable by a universal-existential or an existential-universal formula.

arXiv:1411.6844v1 [math.LO] 25 Nov 2014

1. Introduction

A number of new results about definability and definitions of henselian valuations without parameters in the language of rings have been proven recently. Here, a valuation v on a field K is called *$\emptyset$-definable* if its valuation ring $\mathcal{O}_v$ is a first-order parameter-free definable subset of the field K. Whereas some of the new developments focus more on the existence of definable henselian valuations ([Hon14], [JK14a]), others put a further emphasis on the quantifier complexity of the formulae involved ([CDLM13], [AK14], [Feh14]). Inspired by the latter, Prestel has proven characterizations when a valuation in an elementary class of valued fields is uniformly $\emptyset$-$\exists$-definable, $\emptyset$-$\forall$-definable, $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable or $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable (see Theorem 2.1 and [Pre14]). These criteria work via the compactness theorem and hence only give the existence of, rather than explicit, formulae. A natural question arising from Prestel's results is whether indeed every $\emptyset$-definable henselian valuation is already $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable or $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable.

Since a field can carry a vast amount of inequivalent henselian valuations – some of which are definable, and some of which are not – it seems hopeless to get a general classification of the quantifier complexity of arbitrary definable henselian valuations. However, every field K carries a unique *canonical* henselian valuation, and the task of classifying those according to their quantifier complexity turns out to be much more sensible and feasible. Unless K is separably closed, this canonical henselian valuation is non-trivial whenever K admits some non-trivial henselian valuation (in which case one also calls the field itself *henselian*) and in many cases is *the* most interesting henselian valuation on K. The goal of this paper is to show that, at least in residue characteristic zero, apart from very exceptional situations, the canonical henselian valuation on a field K is always $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable or $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable, as soon as it is $\emptyset$-definable at all.

We first treat the simplified setting of canonical *p-henselian* valuations (cf. Section 3 for definitions and details) in which we get the best result one can hope for: Depending on whether its residue field is p-closed or not, the canonical p-henselian valuation is either $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable or $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable whenever it is $\emptyset$-definable at all (see Propositions 3.6 and 3.7).

Although the definition of the canonical *henselian* valuation (which we recall in Section 2) suggests a case distinction between separably closed and non-separably closed residue field, it turns out that here the dividing line between $\exists\forall$ and $\forall\exists$ runs somewhere else:

Theorem 1.1. *Let K be a field with canonical henselian valuation v_K whose residue field $F = Kv_K$ has characteristic zero. Assume that v_K is $\emptyset$-definable.*

(1) *If F is not elementarily equivalent to a henselian field, then v_K is $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable.*
(2) *If F is elementarily equivalent to a henselian field, then v_K is $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable if the absolute Galois group G_F of F is a small profinite group.*

Recall that G_F is small iff F has only finitely many Galois extensions of degree n for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, case (2) includes in particular the important cases, let us call them (2a) and (2b), where F is algebraically closed resp. real closed.

The proof of (1) is straightforward and does not even need the assumption that v_K is $\emptyset$-definable (Proposition 5.5). Also in case (2a), a direct proof gives a stronger result than stated here (Corollary 4.3). The general case (2) is more difficult to handle. In fact, if the residue field of the canonical henselian valuation is not separably closed, then it is never henselian. Except for separably or real closed fields, very few examples of fields F that are not henselian but elementarily equivalent to a henselian field are known, and we do not know whether in this case the canonical henselian valuation on K is always $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable or $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable in general. The case we can handle, namely when the absolute Galois group is small, is proven using, among other things, Koenigsmann's Galois characterization of tamely branching valuations (Theorem 5.10). In the last section, we construct an example to demonstrate that such fields with small absolute Galois groups do exist (Proposition 6.7). We also construct several examples along the way to show that, in general, our results can not be improved in terms of quantifier complexity (see Examples 3.10, 3.11, 4.6, 5.4, and 6.8).

2. Notation and some facts

Throughout this paper, we use the following notation: For a valued field (K, v), we denote the valuation ring by $\mathcal{O}_v$, the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_v$ by $\mathfrak{m}_v$, the residue field by Kv and the value group by vK. For an element $a \in \mathcal{O}_v$, we write $\overline{a}$ to refer to its image in Kv. For valuations v and w on K we write $v \subseteq w$ to indicate that v is finer than w, i.e. $\mathcal{O}_v \subseteq \mathcal{O}_w$. We denote by K^{sep} a fixed separable closure of K and by $G_K = \mathrm{Gal}(K^{\mathrm{sep}}|K)$ the absolute Galois group of K.

Several of our examples involve power series fields. For a field F and an ordered abelian group Γ, we write

$$F((\Gamma)) = F((t^\Gamma)) = \Big\{ \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} a_\gamma t^\gamma \mid a_\gamma \in F, \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid a_\gamma \neq 0\} \text{ is well-ordered} \Big\}$$

for the field of generalized power series over F with exponents in Γ. The *power series valuation*

$$v\Big(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} a_\gamma t^\gamma \Big) := \min\{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid a_\gamma \neq 0\}$$

is a henselian valuation on $F((\Gamma))$ with residue field F and value group Γ. We write $F(t^\Gamma)$ for the subfield of $F((t^\Gamma))$ generated over F by the monomials t^γ for $\gamma \in \Gamma$. See [Efr06, §4.2] for more details of this construction. If Γ_1 and Γ_2 are ordered abelian groups we denote by $\Gamma_1 \oplus \Gamma_2$ their inverse lexicographic product. There is then a natural isomorphism $F((\Gamma_1 \oplus \Gamma_2)) \cong F((\Gamma_1))((\Gamma_2))$.

All our definitions will be obtained from the following theorem of Prestel [Pre14, Characterization Theorem]:

Theorem 2.1 (Prestel)**.** *Let Σ be a first order axiom system in the ring language $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{ring}}$ together with a unary predicate $\mathcal{O}$. Then there exists an $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{ring}}$-formula $\phi(x)$, defining*

uniformly in every model $(K, \mathcal{O})$ *of* Σ *the set* $\mathcal{O}$*, of quantifier type*

$$\begin{aligned} \exists &\text{ iff } (K_1 \subseteq K_2 \Rightarrow \mathcal{O}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{O}_2) \\ \forall &\text{ iff } (K_1 \subseteq K_2 \Rightarrow \mathcal{O}_2 \cap K_1 \subseteq \mathcal{O}_1) \\ \exists\forall &\text{ iff } (K_1 \prec_\exists K_2 \Rightarrow \mathcal{O}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{O}_2) \\ \forall\exists &\text{ iff } (K_1 \prec_\exists K_2 \Rightarrow \mathcal{O}_2 \cap K_1 \subseteq \mathcal{O}_1) \end{aligned}$$

for all models $(K_1, \mathcal{O}_1)$*,* $(K_2, \mathcal{O}_2)$ *of* Σ*. Here* $K_1 \prec_\exists K_2$ *means that* K_1 *is existentially closed in* K_2*, i.e. every existential* $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ring}}$*-formula* $\rho(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ *with parameters from* K_1 *that holds in* K_2 *also holds in* K_1*.*

We use the above theorem in later sections to show that in order to define the canonical henselian valuation without parameters, only formulae of a low quantifier complexity are needed. We call a field K *henselian* if it admits some non-trivial henselian valuation. There is always a *canonical henselian valuation* on K. We now recall the definition and its defining properties, details can be found in section 4.4 of [EP05].

If a field admits two independent non-trivial henselian valuations, then it is separably closed. This implies that the henselian valuations on a field form a tree: Divide the class of henselian valuations on K into two subclasses, namely

$$H_1(K) = \{v \text{ henselian on } K \mid Kv \neq Kv^{\text{sep}}\}$$

and

$$H_2(K) = \{v \text{ henselian on } K \mid Kv = Kv^{\text{sep}}\}.$$

Then, any valuation $v_2 \in H_2(K)$ is strictly *finer* than any $v_1 \in H_1(K)$, i.e. $\mathcal{O}_{v_2} \subsetneq \mathcal{O}_{v_1}$, and any two valuations in $H_1(K)$ are comparable. Furthermore, if $H_2(K)$ is non-empty, then there exists a unique coarsest $v_K \in H_2(K)$; otherwise there exists a unique finest $v_K \in H_1(K)$. In either case, v_K is called the *canonical henselian valuation*. Note that if K is not separably closed and admits a non-trivial henselian valuation, then v_K is non-trivial.

The definition of the canonical henselian valuation motivates the following

Lemma 2.2. *Let* $K \subset L$ *be an extension of fields such that* K *is relatively algebraically closed in* L*. Let* w *be a henselian valuation on* L*. Then all of the following hold:*

(1) *The restriction* v *of* w *to* K *is also henselian.*
(2) Kv *is separably closed in* Lw*.*
(3) *If* Lw *is separably closed, then* Kv *is also separably closed.*

Proof. (1) See [EP05, 4.1.5].

(2) Let $f \in \mathcal{O}_v[X]$ monic such that $\bar{f} \in Kv[X]$ is separable and irreducible and has a zero in Lw. Since (L, w) is henselian, f has a zero a in L, which, since K is algebraically closed in L, lies in K, hence in $\mathcal{O}_v$. Thus, $\bar{a} \in Kv$ satisfies $\bar{f}(\bar{a}) = 0$, so $\deg(f) = 1$.

(3) This follows immediately from (2).

□

In general, the canonical henselian valuation need not be $\emptyset$-definable. Whenever it is $\emptyset$-definable, this might be for the 'right' or for the 'wrong' reason, see also the discussion in [JK14b, p. 3]. This motivates the next

Definition 2.3. We say that v_K is $\emptyset$-definable *as such* if there is a parameter-free $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ring}}$-formula $\phi(x)$ such that for all fields L with $L \equiv K$, we have $\phi(L) = \mathcal{O}_{v_L}$.

Using Theorem 2.1, we can now draw some first conclusions about the quantifier complexity of definitions of the canonical henselian valuation:

Observation 2.4. *Assume that v_K is $\emptyset$-definable as such. Then,*

(1) *if $v_K \in H_1(K)$, then v_K is $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable,*
(2) *if $v_K \in H_2(K)$, then v_K is $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable.*

Proof. Note that if v_K is $\emptyset$-definable as such, then we have $v_K \in H_2(K)$ iff $v_L \in H_2(L)$ for any $L \equiv K$. Take $L, M \equiv K$ such that $L \prec_\exists M$, so in particular L is relatively algebraically closed in M. By Lemma 2.2, the restriction w of v_M to L is again henselian.

(1) If $v_L \in H_1(L)$, then $H_2(L) = \emptyset$, hence w must be a coarsening of v_L. Hence v_K is $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable by Theorem 2.1.
(2) In case $v_M \in H_2(M)$, Lemma 2.2 implies that $Lw = Lw^{\text{sep}}$. Thus w is a refinement of v_L and so v_K is $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable by Theorem 2.1.

□

As we will see later on, in both cases the definitions are optimal with regard to quantifiers: In Example 5.4, we construct a field K with $v_K \in H_1(K)$ such that v_K is $\emptyset$-definable as such but not $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable. Similarly, we discuss a field K with $v_K \in H_2(K)$ and such that v_K is $\emptyset$-definable as such but not $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable in Example 4.6. In particular, v_K is in both cases in general neither $\emptyset$-$\exists$- nor $\emptyset$-$\forall$-definable.

3. The canonical p-henselian valuation

In this section, we discuss the canonical p-henselian valuation and prove analogues of the observation in the previous section.

Let p be a prime and K a field. If $\text{char}(K) \neq p$, we denote by ζ_p a primitive p-th root of unity in K^{sep}. We define $K(p)$ to be the compositum of all Galois extensions of K of p-power degree inside K^{sep}.

Definition 3.1. A valuation v on K is called *p-henselian* if v extends uniquely to $K(p)$. We call K *p-henselian* if K admits a non-trivial p-henselian valuation.

As with henselian valuations, there is an equivalent definition involving the lifting of zeroes from the residue field:

Proposition 3.2 ([Koe95, Proposition 1.2])**.** *For a valued field (K, v), the following are equivalent:*

(1) *v is p-henselian,*
(2) *for every polynomial $f \in \mathcal{O}_v$ which splits in $K(p)$ and every $a \in \mathcal{O}_v$ with $\bar{f}(\overline{a}) = 0$ and $\bar{f}'(\overline{a}) \neq 0$, there exists $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_v$ with $f(\alpha) = 0$ and $\overline{\alpha} = \overline{a}$.*

The following facts can be found in [Koe95]. If K admits two independent non-trivial p-henselian valuations, then $K = K(p)$. We can once more divide the class of p-henselian valuations on K into two subclasses, namely

$$H_1^p(K) = \{v \text{ } p\text{-henselian on } K \mid Kv \neq Kv(p)\}$$

and

$$H_2^p(K) = \{v \text{ } p\text{-henselian on } K \mid Kv = Kv(p)\}.$$

Then, any valuation $v_2 \in H_2^p(K)$ is strictly *finer* than any $v_1 \in H_1^p(K)$, and any two valuations in $H_1^p(K)$ are comparable. Furthermore, if $H_2^p(K)$ is non-empty, then there exists a unique coarsest $v_K^p \in H_2^p(K)$; otherwise there exists a unique finest $v_K^p \in H_1^p(K)$.

In either case, v_K^p is called the *canonical p-henselian valuation*. Note that if $K \neq K(p)$ admits a non-trivial p-henselian valuation, then v_K^p is also non-trivial.

We get the following variant of Lemma 2.2:

Lemma 3.3. *Let $K \subset L$ be an extension of fields such that K is p-closed in L, i.e. $K(p) \cap L = K$. Let w be a p-henselian valuation on L. Then the following holds:*

(1) *The restriction v of w to K is also p-henselian.*
(2) *Kv is p-closed in Lw, i.e. $Kv(p) \cap Lw = Kv$.*
(3) *If $Lw = Lw(p)$, then $Kv = Kv(p)$.*

Proof. (1) The assumption $K(p) \cap L = K$ implies that L and $K(p)$ are linearly disjoint over K, so every extension of v to $K(p)$ is the restriction of the unique extension of w to $K(p)L \subseteq L(p)$.

(2) Let $g \in Kv[X]$ be of degree p that splits in $Kv(p)$ and has zero in Lw. By [EP05, 4.2.6], there is $f \in \mathcal{O}_v[X]$ monic of degree p with $\bar{f} = g$ such that f splits in $K(p)$. Since (L, w) is p-henselian, f has a zero a in L, which by $L \cap K(p) = K$ lies in $\mathcal{O}_v$, so $g(\bar{a}) = 0$ and g splits already in Kv. Since every Galois extension of p-power degree contains a Galois extension of degree p, this proves the claim.

(3) This follows immediately from (2), as $Kv(p) \subseteq Lw(p)$.

□

Definition 3.4. We say that v_K^p is $\emptyset$-definable *as such* if there is a parameter-free $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ring}}$-formula $\phi_p(x)$ such that for all fields L with $L \equiv K$, we have $\phi_p(L) = \mathcal{O}_{v_L^p}$.

Unlike the canonical henselian valuation, the canonical p-henselian valuation is usuall y $\emptyset$-definable as such. Recall that a field K is *Euclidean* if $[K(2) : K] = 2$.

Theorem 3.5 ([JK14b, Main Theorem])**.** *Fix a prime p. There exists a parameter-free $\mathcal{L}_{ring}$-formula $\phi_p(x)$ such that for any field K with either $\operatorname{char}(K) = p$ or $\zeta_p \in K$ the following are equivalent:*

(1) *ϕ_p defines v_K^p as such.*
(2) *v_K^p is $\emptyset$-definable as such.*
(3) *$p \neq 2$ or Kv_K^p is not Euclidean.*

We can now prove the p-henselian analogues of Observation 2.4.

Proposition 3.6. *Let p be a prime. Consider the elementary class of valued fields*

$$\mathcal{K} := \{(K, v) \mid v = v_K^p \in H_1^p(K), \zeta_p \in K \text{ if } char(K) \neq p, Kv \text{ not Euclidean if } p = 2\}$$

Then v_K^p is uniformly $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable for all K with $(K, v_K^p) \in \mathcal{K}$.

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{K}$ is elementary by Theorem 3.5. Take $(L, v_L^p), (M, v_M^p) \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $L \prec_\exists M$. By Lemma 3.3, the restriction w of v_M^p to L is p-henselian. As $v_L^p \in H_1^p(L)$, v_L^p is the finest p-henselian valuation on L, and thus we get $\mathcal{O}_{v_L^p} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_w \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{v_M^p}$ and hence uniform $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definability by Theorem 2.1. □

Proposition 3.7. *Let p be a prime. Consider the elementary class of valued fields*

$$\mathcal{K} := \{(K, v) \mid v = v_K^p \in H_2^p(K) \text{ and } \zeta_p \in K \text{ if } \operatorname{char}(K) \neq p\}.$$

Then v_K^p is uniformly $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable for all K with $(K, v_K^p) \in \mathcal{K}$.

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{K}$ is elementary by Theorem 3.5. Take $(L, v_L^p), (M, v_M^p) \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $L \prec_\exists M$. Using Lemma 3.3 again, the restriction w of v_M^p to L is p-henselian and we have $Lw = Lw(p)$, so $w \in H_2^p(L)$ and therefore $\mathcal{O}_w \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{v_L}$. Thus, we get uniform $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definability by Theorem 2.1. □

Theorem 3.5 includes an exception in case $p = 2$ and Kv_K^2 is Euclidean. However, in this case some coarsening of v_K^2 is nonetheless $\emptyset$-definable:

Proposition 3.8 ([JK14b, Observation 2.3])**.** *Let $K \neq K(2)$, and assume that Kv_K^2 is Euclidean. Then the coarsest 2-henselian valuation v_K^{2*} on K which has Euclidean residue field is $\emptyset$-definable.*

Again, this definition can be found to be of type $\forall\exists$:

Proposition 3.9. *Consider the elementary class of valued fields*

$$\mathcal{K} := \{(K, v) \mid Kv_K^2 \text{ is Euclidean and } v = v_K^{2*}\}$$

Then v_K^{2*} is uniformly $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable for all K with $(K, v_K^{2*}) \in \mathcal{K}$.

Proof. The class of fields

$$\mathcal{K}_0 := \{K \mid Kv_K^2 \text{ Euclidean}\}$$

is elementary by [JK14b, Observation 2.3(b)]. Furthermore, the proof of [JK14b, Observation 2.3(a)] shows that v_K^{2*} is uniformly $\emptyset$-definable in any $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$. Thus, $\mathcal{K}$ is an elementary class of valued fields.

The rest of the proof is similar to the one of Proposition 3.7: Take $(L, v_L^{2*}), (M, v_M^{2*}) \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $L \prec_\exists M$. Using Lemma 3.3, the restriction w of v_M^{2*} to L is 2-henselian and we have $Lw(2) \cap Mv_M^{2*} = Lw$. This implies that $[Lw(2) : Lw] \leq [Mv_M^{2*}(2) : Mv_M^{2*}] = 2$, as Mv_M^{2*} is Euclidean. Therefore, since $v_L^2 \in H_1^2(L)$ implies that $Lw \neq Lw(2)$, we conclude that $[Lw(2) : Lw] = 2$, so Lw is Euclidean. In particular, w is a refinement of v_L^{2*}. Thus, Theorem 2.1 implies uniform $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definability. □

In general, v_K^p need not be *simultaneously* $\forall\exists$- and $\exists\forall$-definable without parameters:

Example 3.10. Fix a prime p. We construct a field K with $v_K^p \in H_2^p(K)$ such that v_K^p is $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable as such but not $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable.

Consider the field $K_0 = \mathbb{C}((\mathbb{Q}))$ and let $H = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Q}$ (recall that the direct sum is ordered *inverse* lexicographically). In particular, H is discrete and there is an embedding of ordered groups $\mathbb{Q} \to H$. Let D be the divisible hull of H. Note that the theory of divisible ordered abelian groups is model complete (see [Mar02, 3.1.17]). So, as D contains $\mathbb{Q}$, we have $\mathbb{Q} \prec D$ in the language of ordered groups. This implies in particular $\mathbb{Q} \prec_\exists H$ (as ordered abelian groups). Take a copy H_i of H for each $i \geq 0$ and let

$$\Gamma = H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus \ldots,$$

again with inverse lexicographic order. Now [Wei90, Corollary 1.7] yields that

$$G_1 := \mathbb{Q} \oplus \Gamma \prec_\exists H_0 \oplus \Gamma =: G_2$$

as ordered abelian groups. Consider the fields $K_1 = \mathbb{C}((G_1)) \cong K_0((\Gamma))$ and $K_2 = \mathbb{C}((G_2))$. For $i = 1, 2$, let v_i denote the henselian valuation on K_i with value group G_i and residue field $\mathbb{C}$, and let w denote the henselian valuation on K_1 with value group Γ and residue field K_0. Then the Ax-Kochen/Ersov-Theorem (see [PD11, 4.6.4]) implies $(K_1, w) \equiv (K_2, v_2)$ since $K_0 \equiv \mathbb{C}$ and $\Gamma \cong G_2$. Moreover, $(K_1, v_1) \prec_\exists (K_2, v_2)$ by a well-known variant of the Ax-Kochen/Ersov-Theorem (see p. 183 in [KP84]), thus we get in particular $K_1 \prec_\exists K_2$ in the language of rings. However, $v_{K_1}^p = w$ (since Γ is discrete) and $v_{K_2}^p = v_2$. Hence, the restriction of $v_{K_2}^p$ to K_1 is a proper refinement of $v_{K_1}^p$. Thus, the canonical p-henselian valuation on K_1 is not $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable by Theorem 2.1, although it is $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable as such by Proposition 3.7. Note that in fact v_K^p is henselian, so this also gives an example of an $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable henselian valuation which is not $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable (cf. Example 4.6).

Conversely, we give an example of a canonical p-henselian valuation which is $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable but not $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable:

Example 3.11. Fix any prime p. We construct a field K with $v_K^p \in H_1^p(K)$ such that v_K^p is $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable as such but not $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable.

We first construct a field k with $k \cong k((\mathbb{Q}))(X)$ containing a primitive pth root of unity ζ_p: For $i \geq 1$, let

$$k_{i+1} := \mathbb{C}((t_{i+1}^{\mathbb{Q}}))(X_{i+1})((t_i^{\mathbb{Q}}))(X_i)\dots((t_1^{\mathbb{Q}}))(X_1).$$

and

$$k := \bigcup_{i\geq 1} k_i.$$

Then $k \cong k((t_0^{\mathbb{Q}}))(X_0)$ by mapping

$$X_i \mapsto X_{i-1} \text{ and } t_i \mapsto t_{i-1} \text{ for } i > 0.$$

Take $L_1 := k((u^{\mathbb{Q}}))((v^{\mathbb{Q}}))$ and $L_2 := k((u^{\mathbb{Q}}))(X)((v^{\mathbb{Q}}))$. Denote by v_1 the power series valuation on L_1 with value group $\mathbb{Q}\oplus\mathbb{Q}$ and residue field k, and by v_2 the power series valuation on L_2 with value group $\mathbb{Q}$ and residue field $k((u^{\mathbb{Q}}))(X)$. Then, by Ax-Kochen/Ersov ([PD11, 4.6.4]), we have

$$(L_1, v_1) \equiv (L_2, v_2)$$

since $k \equiv k((u^{\mathbb{Q}}))(X)$ holds by construction and since $\mathbb{Q} \oplus \mathbb{Q}$ is divisible and thus elementarily equivalent to $\mathbb{Q}$. Furthermore, we have

$$L_1 \prec_\exists L_2$$

by a well-known Ax-Kochen/Ersov variant (see p. 183 in [KP84]) since we have $\mathbb{Q} \prec_\exists \mathbb{Q}$ and

$$k((u^{\mathbb{Q}})) \prec_\exists k((u^{\mathbb{Q}}))(X),$$

as every purely transcendental extension of a field can be embedded into any sufficiently large elementary extension. Since k is by construction hilbertian (see [FJ08, 13.2.1]), it is not p-henselian, not Euclidean and admits Galois extensions of degree p (see [JK14a, Lemma 3.2]). Thus, $v_{L_1}^p = v_1$. Furthermore, $v_{L_1}^p$ is $\emptyset$-definable as such by an $\exists\forall$-formula by Proposition 3.6. On the other hand, $v_{L_2}^p = v_2$. Thus, the restriction of $v_{L_2}^p$ to L_1 is a proper coarsening of $v_{L_1}^p$ and so $v_{L_1}^p$ is not $\emptyset$-definable by an $\forall\exists$-formula by Theorem 2.1. In fact, $v_{L_1}^p$ coincides with the canonical henselian valuation, so this also gives rise to an example of a canonical henselian valuation which is not $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable (cf. Example 5.4).

4. The case $v_K \in H_2(K)$

Consider a field K with with canonical henselian valuation $v_K \in H_2(K)$ and $\mathrm{char}(Kv_K) = 0$. We now want to show that if v_K is $\emptyset$-definable on such a field, then it is already $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable.

Lemma 4.1. *Let Γ be any ordered abelian group. Consider the field $L = \mathbb{C}((\Gamma))$ and let v denote the power series valuation on L. Then no proper refinement of v is $\mathbb{C}$-definable.*

Proof. Let w be a proper refinement of v and suppose that $\mathcal{O}_w = \phi(L)$ for some formula ϕ with parameters from $\mathbb{C}$. Let $K_0 \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be an algebraically closed field of finite transcendence degree that contains those parameters. As w refines v, w induces a non-trivial valuation $\overline{w}$ on the residue field $Lv = \mathbb{C}$, and since the residue map $\mathcal{O}_v \to \mathbb{C}$ is the identity on $\mathbb{C}$, the restriction of w to $\mathbb{C}$ equals $\overline{w}$. Thus, since K_0 is a proper subfield of $\mathbb{C}$, there is some $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus K_0$ with $w(a) > 0$. As $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C}|K_0)$ acts transitively on $\mathbb{C} \setminus K_0$,

there is some $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C}|K_0)$ with $\sigma(a) = a^{-1}$. We can extend σ to an automorphism $\sigma' \in \mathrm{Aut}(L|K_0)$ by setting

$$\sigma'\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} a_\gamma t^\gamma\right) = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \sigma(a_\gamma)t^\gamma.$$

Since σ' fixes the parameters of ϕ, $\sigma'(\mathcal{O}_w) = \mathcal{O}_w$, contradicting $\sigma'(a) = a^{-1} \notin \mathcal{O}_w$. □

Proposition 4.2. *Let K be a field with $v_K \in H_2(K)$ and $\mathrm{char}(Kv_K) = 0$. Then no proper refinement of v_K is $\emptyset$-definable.*

Proof. Let w be a proper refinement of v_K and suppose that $\mathcal{O}_w = \phi(K)$ for some formula ϕ. Since the theory of algebraically closed fields of characteristic 0 is complete, Ax-Kochen/Ersov ([PD11, 4.6.4]) implies that $(K, v_K) \equiv (L, v)$, where $L = \mathbb{C}((v_K K))$ and v is the power series valuation on L. Since this is an elementary equivalence of valued fields, and $\phi(K) \subsetneqq \mathcal{O}_{v_K}$, also $\phi(L) \subsetneqq \mathcal{O}_v$, so ϕ defines a proper refinement of v, which is impossible by Lemma 4.1. □

Corollary 4.3. *Let K be a field with $v_K \in H_2(K)$ and $\mathrm{char}(Kv_K) = 0$. If v_K is $\emptyset$-definable, then v_K is $\emptyset$-definable as such by an $\forall\exists$-formula.*

Proof. Let ϕ be a formula that defines v_K. If $L \equiv K$, then $\phi(L)$ is a henselian valuation ring $\mathcal{O}_w$ with $w \in H_2(L)$ and $\mathrm{char}(Lw) = 0$. In particular, $v_L \in H_2(L)$ and $\mathrm{char}(Lv_L) = 0$, so Proposition 4.2 implies that $w = v_L$, hence ϕ defines v_K as such. The claim now follows from Observation 2.4. □

Remark 4.4. Let K be a field with $v_K \in H_2(K)$, $\mathrm{char}(Kv_K) = 0$ and $K \neq K^{\mathrm{sep}}$. Then for some prime p, v_K^p is a non-trivial coarsening of v_K (cf. [JK14a, Theorem 3.10]). Thus, since $\zeta_p \in K$, Proposition 3.7 shows that K always admits *some* $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable henselian valuation.

Example 4.5. We construct a field K with $v_K \in H_2(K)$ which is *not* $\emptyset$-definable: Let $K = \mathbb{C}((\Gamma))$, where

$$\Gamma = \bigoplus_p \mathbb{Z}_{(p)} = \ldots \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{(5)} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{(3)} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$$

is ordered inverse lexicographically. Here, p runs over all prime numbers, and $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ is the localization of $\mathbb{Z}$ at p. For every prime l, the canonical l-henselian valuation on K is the power series valuation on K with value group $\bigoplus_{p\leq l} \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ and residue field $\mathbb{C}((\bigoplus_{p>l} \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}))$. However, the canonical henselian valuation on K is the power series valuation on K with residue field $\mathbb{C}$ and value group Γ. In particular, we have $\mathrm{char}(Kv_K) = 0$, $v_K \in H_2(K)$ and $v_K \subsetneq v_K^p$ for all primes p.

We now use Proposition 4.2 to see that the canonical henselian valuation is not $\emptyset$-definable on K: Note that Γ has a nontrivial p-divisible subgroup for every prime p, thus $\Gamma \equiv \mathbb{Q} \oplus \Gamma$, see Lemma 5.9 below. Now consider $L := \mathbb{C}((\mathbb{Q} \oplus \Gamma))$ with the power series valuation w. By the Ax-Kochen/Ershov Theorem ([PD11, 4.6.4]), $(K, v_K) \equiv (L, w)$. If v_K were $\emptyset$-definable, the same formula would define w on L. However, the canonical henselian valuation on L has value group Γ and residue field $\mathbb{C}((\mathbb{Q}))$, so w is a proper refinement of v_L, contradicting Proposition 4.2.

Note that if $p < q$, we have $\mathcal{O}_{v_K^q} \subsetneq \mathcal{O}_{v_K^p}$. Thus, there are countably many different henselian valuations $\emptyset$-definable on K. Since v_K is not $\emptyset$-definable, all $\emptyset$-definable henselian valuations on K are in $H_1(K)$ by Proposition 4.2.

Example 4.6. Recall that Example 3.10 discusses a field $K_2 := \mathbb{C}((G_2))$ where G_2 is some ordered abelian group with certain properties. We show there that the power series valuation v_2 on K_2 coincides with the canonical p-henselian valuation and is $\emptyset$-definable but not $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable. However, we also have $v_2 = v_{K_2}$, so by Corollary 4.3, the canonical henselian valuation v_{K_2} is $\emptyset$-definable as such but again not $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable.

5. The case $v_K \in H_1(K)$

Let K be a henselian field with $v_K \in H_1(K)$ and $\mathrm{char}(Kv_K) = 0$. Unlike in the case $v_K \in H_2(K)$, it is not true that v_K is already $\emptyset$-definable as such whenever it is $\emptyset$-definable. In order to explain this, we need the following

Definition 5.1. A field K is called *t-henselian* if there is some $L \equiv K$ such that L admits a non-trivial henselian valuation.

Equivalently, t-henselianity can be axiomatized in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{ring}}$ via the axiom scheme of admitting a t-henselian topology, see [PZ78, Remark 7.11] and [Pre91, p. 203]. In [PZ78, p. 338], Prestel and Ziegler construct a t-henselian field k of characteristic 0 which is not henselian and neither algebraically nor real closed. In particular, no henselian field $L \equiv k$ can admit any non-trivial $\emptyset$-definable henselian valuation. Furthermore, they show that any sufficiently saturated elementary extension of a t-henselian field is henselian ([PZ78, Theorem 7.2]).

Example 5.2. Let k be a t-henselian field of characteristic 0 which is not henselian and neither algebraically nor real closed.

- Then v_k is $\emptyset$-definable as it is trivial. However, if $k \prec L$ is an elementary extension with L henselian, then v_L is not $\emptyset$-definable: Else, k would also admit a non-trivial $\emptyset$-definable henselian valuation, contradicting the assumption that k is not henselian.
- The trivial valuation is not the only example for a canonical henselian valuation which is $\emptyset$-definable but not $\emptyset$-definable as such: Consider $K = k((\mathbb{Z}))$. Then v_K is the power series valuation with value group $\mathbb{Z}$. By a result of Ax ([Ax65]), there is an $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{ring}}$-formula $\phi(x)$ that uniformly defines all henselian valuations with value group $\mathbb{Z}$ and residue field of characteristic zero. Now take once more $L \succ k$ henselian and consider $M = L((\mathbb{Z}))$. Then, since L is henselian, v_M is a proper refinement of the power series valuation w on M with residue field L and value group $\mathbb{Z}$. However, we get $\phi(M) = \mathcal{O}_w$. Let now $\psi(x)$ be any other $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{ring}}$-formula defining $\mathcal{O}_{v_K}$ in K. Then
$$K \models \forall x(\psi(x) \longleftrightarrow \phi(x)),$$
so any such formula will again define $\mathcal{O}_w$ in M. Hence, v_K is $\emptyset$-definable but not $\emptyset$-definable as such.

Observation 5.3. *Let K be a henselian field with $\mathrm{char}(Kv_K) = 0$ and assume that v_K is $\emptyset$-definable. Then v_K is $\emptyset$-definable as such iff Kv_K is separably closed or not t-henselian.*

Proof. Assume that K is a field with $\mathrm{char}(Kv_K) = 0$ such that v_K is $\emptyset$-definable, say via the $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{ring}}$-formula $\phi(x)$.

Assume first that v_K is not $\emptyset$-definable as such. Then, using Corollary 4.3, we get $v_K \in H_1(K)$. Furthermore, there is some $L \equiv K$ such that $\phi(L) =: \mathcal{O}_w \neq \mathcal{O}_{v_L}$. Since we have $Lw \equiv Kv_K$ and $v_K \in H_1(K)$, Lw is not separably closed, so we get $\mathcal{O}_w \supsetneq \mathcal{O}_{v_L}$. In particular, v_L induces a non-trivial henselian valuation on Lw, so Lw is henselian. Hence Kv_K is t-henselian.

Assume now that Kv_K is not separably closed but t-henselian. Take some $L \succ Kv_K$ henselian and let u be the power series valuation on $K' := L((v_K K))$. By Ax-Kochen/Ershov ([PD11, 4.6.4]), $(K, v_K) \equiv (K', u)$, so ϕ defines $\mathcal{O}_u$ in K'. Since u is a proper coarsening of $v_{K'}$, we get that v_K is not $\emptyset$-definable as such. □

Recall that we have shown in Observation 2.4 that in case we have $v_K \in H_1(K)$ and v_K is $\emptyset$-definable as such, then v_K is $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable. We use the above Observation to show that, in general, this definition cannot be improved when it comes to quantifiers:

Example 5.4. We construct a field K with $v_K \in H_1(K)$ such that v_K is $\emptyset$-definable as such but not $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable.

Recall that in Example 3.11 we construct a field k with $k \cong k((\mathbb{Q}))(X)$ and extensions $L_1 := k((u^{\mathbb{Q}}))((v^{\mathbb{Q}}))$ and $L_2 := k((u^{\mathbb{Q}}))(X)((v^{\mathbb{Q}}))$ with valuations v_1, v_2 such that $(L_1, v_1) \equiv (L_2, v_2)$ and $L_1 \prec_\exists L_2$. Since k is by construction hilbertian ([FJ08, 13.2.1]), it is not henselian (nor t-henselian, see [FJ08, 15.5.4]) and so the canonical henselian valuation v_{L_1} on L_1 is the power series valuation v_1 with residue field k and value group $\mathbb{Q} \oplus \mathbb{Q}$. Furthermore, v_{L_1} is $\emptyset$-definable (see Example 3.11) and thus $\emptyset$-definable as such by Observation 5.3. On the other hand, the canonical henselian valuation v_{L_2} on L_2 is the power series valuation v_2 with residue field $k((u^{\mathbb{Q}}))(X)$ and value group $\mathbb{Q}$. Thus, the restriction of v_{L_2} to L_1 is a proper coarsening of v_{L_1} and so v_{L_1} is not $\emptyset$-definable by an $\forall\exists$-formula by Theorem 2.1.

Furthermore, v_K is always $\emptyset$-definable if its residue field is not t-henselian:

Proposition 5.5. *Let K be a field with $v_K \in H_1(K)$ and Kv_K not t-henselian. Then v_K is $\emptyset$-definable as such by an $\exists\forall$-formula.*

Proof. Consider the elementary class of valued fields

$$\mathcal{K} := \{(L, v) \mid (L, v) \equiv (K, v_K)\}.$$

Take (L_1, v_1) and (L_2, v_2) in $\mathcal{K}$ with $L_1 \prec_\exists L_2$. Then v_1 is a henselian valuation on L_1 with non-henselian residue field, so $v_1 = v_{L_1}$. As Kv_K is not separably closed, neither is $Lv_1 = Lv_{L_1}$ and we get $v_{L_1} \in H_1(L_1)$. Lemma 2.2 implies that the restriction of v_2 to L_1 is henselian and is hence a coarsening of $v_{L_1} = v_1$. By Theorem 2.1, there is a parameter-free $\exists\forall$-formula defining $\mathcal{O}_v$ in L for any $(L, v) \in \mathcal{K}$. □

We now want to study some assumptions under which $\emptyset$-definability of v_K and Kv_K t-henselian imply that v_K is definable by an $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-formula.

Definition 5.6. Let K be a field. A valuation v on K is called *tamely branching at p* if the value group is not divisible by p, $\mathrm{char}(Kv) \neq p$ and if $[vK : pvK] = p$, then Kv has a finite separable extension of degree divisible by p^2.

Theorem 5.7 (Koenigsmann, [EP05][5.4.3])**.** *A field K admits a henselian valuation, tamely branching at some prime p iff G_K has a non-procyclic p-Sylow subgroup $P \ncong \mathbb{Z}_2 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ with a non-trivial abelian normal closed subgroup N of P.*

Proposition 5.8. *Let k be t-henselian with v_k trivial and $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$. Assume that the absolute Galois group G_k of k is small. Then, both of the following hold:*

1. *For any $L \equiv k$, every henselian valuation w on L with $\mathrm{char}(Lw) = 0$ has divisible value group. In particular, if $L \succ k$, then $v_L L$ is divisible.*
2. *We have $k \equiv k((\mathbb{Q}))$.*

Proof. If k is algebraically closed, then both (1) and (2) are clear. Otherwise, the assumption that v_k is trivial implies that k is not henselian, which we assume now.

(1) Take any $L \equiv k$ and let w be a henselian valuation on L with $\mathrm{char}(Lw) = 0$. If L is not henselian, then w is trivial and wL is divisible. Hence, we may assume that L is henselian. Note that L cannot admit a non-trivial $\emptyset$-definable henselian valuation since otherwise k would be henselian. Thus, by [JK14a, Theorem 3.15], either L is real closed or every finite group occurs as a subquotient of G_L. In case L is real closed, wL is divisible for any henselian valuation on L by [EP05, 4.3.6 and 4.3.7]. In case any finite group occurs as a subquotient of G_L, the same holds for G_{Lw} (see [JK14a, Observation 3.16]). In particular, Lw has a Galois extension of degree divisible by p^2 for every prime p. Assume for a contradiction that wL is not p-divisible. Then w is tamely branching at p, so there is some p-Sylow subgroup P of G_L as in Theorem 5.7. As G_k is small by assumption, we get $G_L \cong G_k$ by [FJ08, 20.4.6], so, using Theorem 5.7 once more, k also admits a non-trivial henselian valuation. This contradicts the assumption that k is not henselian. Hence, wL is divisible.

The last part now follows since for any $L \succ k$ the restriction of v_L to k is trivial, so we get $\mathrm{char}(Lv_L) = 0$.

(2) We now use Ax-Kochen/Ersov ([PD11, 4.6.4]) repeatedly. Note that the lexicographically ordered direct sum of two non-trivial divisible ordered abelian groups is divisible and hence elementarily equivalent to $\mathbb{Q}$. Take again some $L \succ k$ henselian. As the value group of v_L is divisible by the first part, we have

$$k \equiv L \equiv Lv_L((v_L L)) \equiv Lv_L((v_L L \oplus \mathbb{Q})) \cong Lv_L((v_L L))((\mathbb{Q})) \equiv L((\mathbb{Q})) \equiv k((\mathbb{Q})).$$

□

The following Lemma is probably well-known:

Lemma 5.9. *Let Γ be an ordered abelian group. The following are equivalent:*

(1) *Γ has a non-trivial p-divisible convex subgroup for every prime p.*
(2) *Γ is elementarily equivalent to an ordered abelian group Γ' which has a non-trivial divisible convex subgroup.*
(3) *$\Gamma \equiv \mathbb{Q} \oplus \Gamma$.*
(4) *$\Gamma \equiv \mathbb{Q} \oplus \Delta$ for some ordered abelian group Δ.*

Proof. For a prime p, we consider the formula

$$\gamma_p(x) \ \equiv \ (x > 0) \wedge \forall y \ (-x \leq y \leq x \longrightarrow \exists z \ pz = y).$$

Then, in an ordered abelian group, the sentence

$$\phi_p \ \equiv \ \exists x \ \gamma_p(x)$$

axiomatizes the existence of a non-trivial p-divisible convex subgroup.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Assume Γ has a non-trivial p-divisible convex subgroup for every prime p. Since the convex subgroups of Γ are ordered by inclusion, the type

$$q(x) = \{\gamma_p(x) \mid p \text{ prime}\}$$

is finitely satisfiable in Γ. Hence, it is realized in some sufficiently saturated $\Gamma' \succ \Gamma$. Now, Γ' has a non-trivial divisible convex subgroup.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Assume that $\Gamma \equiv \Gamma'$ and that Γ' has a non-trivial divisible convex subgroup D with $\Gamma'/D = \Delta$. By [Gir88, bottom of p. 282], $\Gamma' \equiv D \oplus \Delta$. Since D is divisible, $D \equiv \mathbb{Q} \oplus D$. Thus, since lexicographic products preserve elementary equivalence, cf. [Gir88, proof of 3.3], we get that

$$\Gamma \equiv \Gamma' \equiv D \oplus \Delta \equiv \mathbb{Q} \oplus D \oplus \Delta \equiv \mathbb{Q} \oplus \Gamma.$$

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (4): Immediate.
(4) $\Rightarrow$ (1): This is clear, since $\mathbb{Q} \oplus \Delta \models \phi_p$ for all primes p. $\square$

We can now prove the following:

Theorem 5.10. *Assume that* $\mathrm{char}(Kv_K) = 0$. *If* v_K *is* $\emptyset$*-definable,* Kv_K *is t-henselian and* G_{Kv_K} *is small, then* v_K *is definable by an* $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$*-formula.*

Proof. Let $\phi(x)$ be the $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{ring}}$-formula defining v_K. Note that $Kv_K \equiv Kv_K((\mathbb{Q}))$ holds by Proposition 5.8. This implies that

$$v_K K \not\equiv \mathbb{Q} \oplus v_K K, \tag{1}$$

since otherwise, Ax-Kochen/Ersov ([PD11, 4.6.4]) gives that

$$(K, v_K) \equiv (Kv_K((\mathbb{Q}))\underbrace{((v_K K))}_{u_1}, u_1) \equiv (Kv_K\underbrace{((\mathbb{Q}))((v_K K))}_{u_2}, u_2)$$

contradicting that ϕ defines v_K.

Claim: If $(L, v) \equiv (K, v_K)$, then v is the coarsest henselian valuation on L with $Lv \equiv Kv_K$.

Proof of claim: Assume that $w \supseteq v$ with $Lw \equiv Kv_K$. Then v induces a henselian valuation $\bar{v}$ on Lw with residue field $(Lw)\bar{v} = Lv$. In particular, we have $\mathrm{char}((Lw)\bar{v}) = 0$. By Proposition 5.8, the value group $\bar{v}(Lw)$ of the induced valuation, which is a convex subgroup of vL, is divisible. Since $vL \equiv v_K K$, Lemma 5.9 together with (1) above now imply that $\bar{v}(Lw)$ is trivial. Thus we conclude $w = v$.

Take (L_1, v_1), $(L_2, v_2) \equiv (K, v_K)$ with $L_1 \prec_\exists L_2$. Let w be the restriction of v_2 to L_1. By Lemma 2.2, w is henselian. Note that w and v_1 are comparable: If $v_1 \in H_1(L_1)$ then v_1 is comparable to any henselian valuation on L_1 (cf. section 2). In case we have $v_1 \in H_2(L_1)$, we get – using the Claim – that v_1 is the coarsest henselian valuation on L_1 with algebraically closed residue field. Thus, we have $v_1 = v_{L_1}$ and so again v_1 is comparable to any henselian valuation on L_1.

Now, assume for a contradiction that w is a proper coarsening of v_1. Then v_1 induces a henselian valuation $\bar{v}_1$ on $L_1 w$ with residue field $(L_1 w)\bar{v}_1 = L_1 v_1 \equiv Kv_K$ and value group $\Delta := \bar{v}_1(L_1 w)$ a nontrivial convex subgroup of $v_1 L_1$. By Ax-Kochen/Ersov, $L_1 w \equiv Kv_K((\Delta))$, and the Claim gives that $L_1 w \not\equiv Kv_K$. By (1) and Lemma 5.9, Δ is not divisible. Recall that $L_1 w$ is relatively algebraically closed in $L_2 v_2$ by Lemma 2.2. Thus, the restriction homomorphism

$$r : G_{L_2 v_2} \longrightarrow G_{L_1 w}$$

is surjective. By [EP05, 5.2.6], the residue homomorphism induced by $\bar{v}_1$,

$$\pi : G_{L_1 w} \longrightarrow G_{L_1 v_1},$$

is also surjective. Since G_{Kv_K} is small by assumption, we have $G_{Kv_K} \cong G_{L_1 v_1} \cong G_{L_2 v_2}$ (see [FJ08, 20.4.6]), so the epimorphism

$$\pi \circ r : G_{L_2 v_2} \longrightarrow G_{L_1 v_1}$$

is actually an isomorphism ([FJ08, 16.10.6]), implying that both r and π are isomorphisms. In particular,

$$G_{Kv_K} \cong G_{L_1 w} \cong G_{Kv_K((\Delta))}.$$

If I denotes the inertia group of the power series valuation on $Kv_K((\Delta))$, then reduction gives an homomorphism $\pi : G_{Kv_K((\Delta))} \to G_{Kv_K}$ with kernel I (cf. [EP05, 5.2.6]). Since G_{Kv_K} is small and $G_{Kv_K((\Delta))} \cong G_{Kv_K}$ this implies that $I = 1$. As $I = \prod_p \mathbb{Z}_p^{d_p}$ with

$d_p = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\Delta/p\Delta)$ (see [EP05, 5.3.3]), we conclude that Δ is divisible, a contradiction. Therefore, w is a refinement of v_1, so the claim follows from Theorem 2.1. □

Note that we construct fields which are t-henselian but not henselian with small absolute Galois group in the last section. Thus, the hypotheses of the above Theorem is not empty. Overall, we can now combine several of our results to get the following Theorem as stated in the introduction:

Theorem 1.1. *Let K be a field with canonical henselian valuation v_K whose residue field $F = Kv_K$ has characteristic zero. Assume that v_K is $\emptyset$-definable.*

(1) *If F is not elementarily equivalent to a henselian field, then v_K is $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable.*
(2) *If F is elementarily equivalent to a henselian field, then v_K is $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable if the absolute Galois group G_F of F is a small profinite group.*

Proof. Let K be a field with $\mathrm{char}(Kv_K) = 0$ and assume that v_K is $\emptyset$-definable. Then, case (1) is a special case of Proposition 5.5. Case (2) follows immediately from Theorem 5.10. □

6. t-henselian non-henselian fields with small absolute Galois group

We refine the construction sketched in [PZ78, p. 338] of a t-henselian field which is neither henselian nor real closed.

Definition 6.1. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that a valued field (K, v) is $n_{\leq}$-henselian if every monic $f \in \mathcal{O}_v[T]$ of degree at most n for which $\bar{f} \in Kv[T]$ has a simple zero $a \in Kv$ has a zero $x \in \mathcal{O}_v$ with $\bar{x} = a$.

Note that (K, v) is henselian if and only if it is $n_{\leq}$-henselian for all n.

Lemma 6.2. *Let v_1 be a valuation on K and v_2 a valuation on Kv_1. If both v_1 and v_2 are $n_{\leq}$-henselian, then so is the valuation $v = v_2 \circ v_1$ on K.*

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{O}_v[T]$ monic of degree at most n such that $\bar{f} \in Kv[T]$ has a simple zero $a \in Kv$. First lift a to a zero $a' \in Kv_1$ of the reduction of f with respect to v_1, and then further to a zero $x \in \mathcal{O}_v$ of f. □

Lemma 6.3. *Let (K, v) be a valued field.*

(1) *If every polynomial*

$$g = T^m + T^{m-1} + \sum_{i=0}^{m-2} a_i T^i \in K[T]$$

with $m \leq n!$ and $a_0, \ldots, a_{m-2} \in \mathfrak{m}_v$ has a zero $x \in \mathcal{O}_v$ with $x + 1 \in \mathfrak{m}_v$, then v extends uniquely to every Galois extension $N|K$ with $[N : K] \leq n$.
(2) *If v extends uniquely to every Galois extension $N|K$ with $[N : K] \leq n!$, then (K, v) is $n_{\leq}$-henselian.*

Proof. The proof follows by standard arguments. Part (1) follows immediately from the proof of (6) ⇒ (1) in [EP05, 4.1.3].

Assume now that the assumption of (2) holds. Let $f \in \mathcal{O}_v[T]$ be monic of degree at most n for which $\bar{f} \in Kv[T]$ has a simple zero $a \in Kv$. We may assume that f is irreducible over $\mathcal{O}_v$, hence, by Gauss' Lemma [EP05, 4.1.2(1)], also over K. Consider the splitting field L of f over K. Then $[L : K] \leq n!$, so by assumption there is a unique extension w of v to L. There are $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in L$ with $f = \prod_{i=1}^{n}(T - a_i)$. By Gauss' Lemma, $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathcal{O}_w$, and without loss of generality we can assume that $\bar{a}_1 = a$.

Suppose for a contradiction that we have $n > 1$. Then there is some $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L|K)$ with $\sigma(a_1) = a_2$. As w is the unique extension of v to L, we have $\sigma(\mathcal{O}_w) = \mathcal{O}_w$. Thus, σ induces an automorphism $\bar{\sigma} \in \mathrm{Gal}(Lw|Kv)$ such that $\bar{a}_2 = \bar{\sigma}(\bar{a}_1) = \bar{\sigma}(a) = a$ holds. This contradicts the fact that a is a simple zero of $\bar{f}$. □

We denote by $\mathbb{P}$ the set of prime numbers.

Lemma 6.4. *Let K_0 be a field of characteristic zero that contains all roots of unity. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n < q \in \mathbb{P}$ and $P \subseteq \mathbb{P}$. Then there exists a valued field (K_1, v) with the following properties:*

(1) *$K_1 v = K_0$ and $vK_1 = \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p} : p \in \mathbb{P} \setminus P]$*
(2) *v is $n_{\leq}$-henselian but not q-henselian.*
(3) *$G_{K_1} = \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle$, where $H_1 \cong \mathbb{Z}_q$ and there is $N \lhd H_2$ closed with $N \cong \prod_{p \in P} \mathbb{Z}_p$ and $H_2/N \cong G_{K_0}$.*

Proof. Let $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p} : p \in \mathbb{P} \setminus P]$, $F_0 = K_0(x)$, $F = K_0(x^\Gamma) \subseteq K_0((x^\Gamma))$, and $F^h = F^{\mathrm{alg}} \cap K_0((x^\Gamma))$. On all subfields of $K_0((x^\Gamma))$ we denote the restriction of the x-adic power series valuation by v. Then $K_1 v = K_0$ for all $K_0 \subseteq K_1 \subseteq K_0((x^\Gamma))$ and $vK_1 = \Gamma$ for all $F \subseteq K_1 \subseteq K_0((x^\Gamma))$.

Let

$$f(T) = T^q - (x+1) \in F_0[T].$$

Since $\bar{f} = T^q - 1$ is separable and completely decomposes over $F_0 v = K_0$, f has a zero $\alpha \in F^h \subseteq K_0((x^\Gamma))$ by Hensel's Lemma. Since f is irreducible over F_0, $F_0(\alpha)|F_0$ is a C_q-extension. The fact that $v(x+1) = 0$ implies that v does not ramify in this extension [FJ08, 2.3.8]. Since v is totally ramified in $F|F_0$ but unramified in $F_0(\alpha)|F_0$, these extensions are linearly disjoint over F_0, cf. [FJ08, 2.5.8], hence also $F(\alpha)|F$ is a C_q-extension, cf. [FJ08, 2.5.2].

Now let $\mathrm{res} : G_F \to \mathrm{Gal}(F(\alpha)|F)$ be the restriction homomorphism and let $Q \leq G_F$ be a q-Sylow subgroup. Then $\mathrm{res}(Q)$ is a q-Sylow subgroup of $\mathrm{Gal}(F(\alpha)|F) \cong C_q$, so there exists $\sigma \in Q$ with $\langle \mathrm{res}(\sigma) \rangle = \mathrm{Gal}(F(\alpha)|F)$. The procyclic group $G_q := \langle \sigma \rangle$ is torsion-free since it is the absolute Galois group of a non-real field, and pro-q as a subgroup of Q, hence $G_q \cong \mathbb{Z}_q$, cf. [FJ08, Ch. 1 Exercise 7].

Let E denote the fixed field of G_q and $K_1 = E \cap F^h$. Then $G_{K_1} = \langle G_q, G_{F^h} \rangle$. By [EP05, 5.3.3], the absolute inertia group I_v of the valuation on F^h satisfies

$$I_v \cong \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \mathbb{Z}_p^{\dim_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\Gamma/p\Gamma)} = \prod_{p \in P} \mathbb{Z}_p,$$

and $G_{F^h}/I_v \cong G_{F^h v} = G_{K_0}$.

Since $E \cap F(\alpha) = F$, $K_1(\alpha)$ is a C_q-extension of K_1 contained in F^h, so (K_1, v) is not q-henselian, cf. [Koe95, Proposition 1.2(iv)]. If $g \in (\mathcal{O}_v \cap K_1)[T]$ is monic of degree at most n and $\bar{g} \in K_1 v[T]$ has a simple zero $a \in K_1 v$, then g has a zero β in F^h with $\bar{\beta} = a$ by Hensel's Lemma. Since $[E(\beta) : E] \leq \deg(g) \leq n < q$ and $G_E \cong \mathbb{Z}_q$, we conclude that $\beta \in E \cap F^h = K_1$, so (K_1, v) is indeed $n_{\leq}$-henselian. □

Construction 6.5. Fix a prime number p_0 and let $K_0 = \mathbb{C}$. For $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ choose a prime number $q_n > \max\{n, p_0\}$ and iteratively use Lemma 6.4 (with $P = \emptyset$) to construct a valued field (K_n, v_n) with $v_n K_n = \mathbb{Q}$, $K_n v_n = K_{n-1}$, K_n $n_{\leq}$-henselian but not q_n-henselian, and $G_{K_n} = \langle G'_{K_n}, G''_{K_n} \rangle$ with $G'_{K_n} \cong \mathbb{Z}_{q_n}$, $G''_{K_n} \cong G_{K_{n-1}}$. By induction, G_{K_n} is finitely generated, in particular small.

For each $n \geq m$, composition of places gives a valuation $v_{n,m} = v_{m+1} \circ \cdots \circ v_n$ on K_n with residue field $K_n v_{n,m} = K_m$. Since $v_n K_n$ is divisible and the class of divisible ordered

abelian groups is closed under extensions, induction shows that $v_{n,0}K_n$ is divisible for all n.

The residue homomorphism $\mathcal{O}_{v_{n,m}} \to K_m$ of $v_{n,m}$ restricts to a homomorphism $\mathcal{O}_{v_{n,0}} \to \mathcal{O}_{v_{m,0}}$. With respect to these homomorphisms, the $\mathcal{O}_{v_{n,0}}$ form an inverse system. The inverse limit $\mathcal{O} = \varprojlim_n \mathcal{O}_{v_{n,0}}$ is again a valuation ring, cf. [FP11, Lemma 3.5]. Let $K = \mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O})$ and v a valuation such that $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_v$. For each n, let $\mathfrak{p}_n$ denote the kernel of the natural projection $\mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}_{v_{n,0}}$ and let v_n^* be a valuation on K with $\mathcal{O}_{v_n^*} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}_n}$. Note that $\bigcap_n \mathfrak{p}_n = (0)$, hence $\bigcup_n \mathcal{O}_{v_n^*} = \mathcal{O}_{\bigcap_n \mathfrak{p}_n} = \mathcal{O}_{(0)} = K$ and

$$vK = K^\times/\mathcal{O}_v^\times = \bigcup_n \mathcal{O}_{v_n^*}^\times/\mathcal{O}_v^\times.$$

As $\mathcal{O}_{v_n^*}^\times/\mathcal{O}_v^\times \cong K_n^\times/\mathcal{O}_{v_{n,0}}^\times = v_{n,0}K_n$, we see that vK is divisible.

Lemma 6.6. *Let G be a profinite group generated by closed subgroups G_0, G_1. If G_0 is pro-q and A is a finite group with $q \nmid \#A$ which is a quotient of G, then A is also a quotient of G_1.*

Proof. Let $\pi : G \to A$ be an epimorphism. Then $\pi(G_0)$ is a q-group, so $G_0 \subseteq \ker(\pi)$ since $q \nmid \#A$. In particular, $G = \langle G_1, \ker(\pi)\rangle$, so the inclusion $G_1 \to G$ induces an epimorphism $G_1 \to G/\ker(\pi) \cong A$. □

Proposition 6.7. *The field K of Construction 6.5 is t-henselian but not henselian, G_K is small and $K(p_0) = K$.*

Proof. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $l_n := \max\{l \in \mathbb{N} : l! \leq n\}$. Observe that each v_n^* is $(l_n)_{\leq}$-henselian: By Lemma 6.3 it suffices to show that each

$$g = T^m + T^{m-1} + \sum_{i=0}^{m-2} a_i T^i \in K[T]$$

with $m \leq n$ and $a_i \in \mathfrak{m}_{v_n^*}$ for $i = 0, \ldots, m-2$ has a zero x in $\mathcal{O}_{v_n^*}$ with $x + 1 \in \mathfrak{m}_{v_n^*}$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let g_k denote the reduction of g with respect to v_k^*. If $k \geq n$, then the reduction of g_k with respect to $v_{k,n}$ is $g_n = T^m + T^{m-1}$, so since $v_{k,n}$ is $n_{\leq}$-henselian by Lemma 6.2, the simple zero $x_n = -1$ uniquely lifts to a zero $x_k \in \mathcal{O}_{v_{k,n}}$ of g_k. Since $x_n \in \mathcal{O}_{v_{n,0}}$, also $x_k \in \mathcal{O}_{v_{k,0}}$. Therefore, $x = (x_k)_k \in \mathcal{O}$ satisfies $g(x) \in \bigcap_k \mathfrak{p}_k = (0)$ and $x + 1 \in \mathfrak{m}_{v_n^*}$. This concludes the proof that v_n^* is $(l_n)_{\leq}$-henselian.

As $l_n \to \infty$ for $n \to \infty$, [PZ78, Theorem 7.2] implies that the topology induced by each of the v_n^* (for $n > 1$) on K is t-henselian.

However, K is not henselian: Suppose that w is a non-trivial henselian valuation on K. Since the topology induced on K by w coincides with the t-henselian topology induced by each of the v_n^* ([PZ78, Theorem 7.9]), and the valuation ring $\bigcup_n \mathcal{O}_{v_n^*} = K$ is trivial, [EP05, 2.3.5] implies that there is some n with $\mathfrak{m}_{v_n^*} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_w$, i.e. $\mathcal{O}_w \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{v_n^*}$. In particular, v_n^* is henselian. This implies that also the valuation induced by v_n^* on $Kv_{n+1}^* = K_{n+1}$ is henselian, but this valuation is exactly v_{n+1}, which is not q_{n+1}-henselian by construction.

We claim that G_K is small: Indeed, otherwise there exist infinitely many distinct extensions $L_1, L_2, \ldots$ of K of the same degree d. Without loss of generality we may assume that all $L_i|K$ are Galois. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $M_k = L_1 \cdots L_k$ be the compositum. Then $A_k := \mathrm{Gal}(M_k|K)$ is a subgroup of $\prod_{i=1}^k \mathrm{Gal}(L_i|K)$, so $\#A_k | d^k$. Choose n with $l_n \geq \max\{|A_k|, d\}$. Since v_n^* is $(l_n)_{\leq}$-henselian, it extends uniquely to M_k by Lemma 6.3. Since v_n^*K is divisible, this extension is unramified, hence the fundamental equality [EP05, 3.3.3] gives that $\mathrm{Gal}(M_k|K) \cong \mathrm{Gal}(M_k v_n^*|K_n)$. In particular, A_k is a quotient of G_{K_n}. For all $m = d, \ldots, n$ we have that $q_m > m \geq d$, hence $q_m \nmid \#A_k$, so Lemma 6.6 shows

that A_k is a quotient also of G_{K_d}. Since k was arbitrary and A_k has at least k distinct quotients of order d, this contradicts that G_{K_d} is small.

Similarly, $K(p_0) = K$: Indeed, otherwise let $M|K$ be a C_{p_0}-extension. Since $q_m > p_0$ for all m, the argument of the previous paragraph shows that there is a C_{p_0}-extension M_0 of K_0, contradicting our choice of K_0. □

Example 6.8. We construct a field K with $v_K \in H_1(K)$, $\mathrm{char}(Kv_K) = 0$ and such that v_K is $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable but not $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable. Note that Observation 2.4 implies that in this case v_K cannot be $\emptyset$-definable as such. Furthermore, by Observation 5.3, for any such field K, we have Kv_K t-henselian.

By Construction 6.5 and Proposition 6.7, for any prime p there is a field k which

- is t-henselian but not henselian,
- has characteristic 0,
- satisfies $k = k(p)$ and
- has small absolute Galois group.

We now repeat the construction from Example 3.10. Define again $H_i = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Q}$, $\Gamma = H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus \ldots$, $G_1 := \mathbb{Q} \oplus \Gamma$, $G_2 := H_0 \oplus \Gamma$, $K_1 := k((G_1))$ and $K_2 := k((G_2))$. As in Example 3.10, we have $G_1 \prec_\exists G_2$ and $K_1 \prec_\exists K_2$. Let v_i denote the valuation on K_i with value group G_i residue field k, and let w denote the valuation on K_1 with value group Γ and residue field $k((\mathbb{Q}))$. By Proposition 5.8, we have $k \equiv k((\mathbb{Q}))$. Therefore, the Ax-Kochen/Ersov Theorem ([PD11, 4.6.4]) implies

$$(K_1, w) \equiv (K_2, v_2).$$

We now have $v_2 = v_{K_2} = v_{K_2}^p$ as $k = k(p)$ holds and as Γ has no p-divisible convex subgroup. Thus, v_2 is $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable by Proposition 3.7. Just like in Example 3.10, the restriction of v_2 to K_1 gives v_1 which is a proper refinement of w.

Thus, $v_2 = v_{K_2}$ is $\emptyset$-$\forall\exists$-definable but not $\emptyset$-$\exists\forall$-definable (see Theorem 2.1).

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Jochen Koenigsmann and Alexander Prestel for many interesting discussions on the subject. In particular, an earlier (unpublished) proof of Jochen Koenigsmann gave us the idea to prove Proposition 5.5. We would also like to thank Immanuel Halupczok for providing an example of a specific ordered abelian group as well as Volker Weispfenning for presenting his results in [Wei90] in an exceptionally clear and helpful way.

References

[AK14] Will Anscombe and Jochen Koenigsmann. An existential $\emptyset$-definition of $F_q[[t]]$ in $F_q((t))$. To appear in *J. Symbolic Logic*, 2014.

[Ax65] James Ax. On the undecidability of power series fields. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 16:846, 1965.

[CDLM13] Raf Cluckers, Jamshid Derakhshan, Eva Leenknegt, Angus Macintyre. Uniformly defining valuation rings in henselian valued fields with finite or pseudo-finite residue field. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 164(12):1236–1246, 2013.

[Efr06] Ido Efrat. *Valuations, Orderings, and Milnor K-Theory*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, 2006.

[EP05] Antonio Engler and Alexander Prestel. *Valued Fields*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, 2005.

[FP11] Arno Fehm and Elad Paran. Non-ample complete valued fields. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, Vol. 2011, No. 18, pp. 4135–4146, 2011.

[Feh14] Arno Fehm. Existential $\emptyset$-definability of henselian valuation rings. To appear in *J. Symbolic Logic*, 2014.

[FJ08] Michael D. Fried and Moshe Jarden. *Field Arithmetic*. Ergebnisse der Mathematik III 11. 3rd edition, revised by M. Jarden. Springer, 2008.

[Gir88] Michèle Giraudet. Cancellation and absorption of lexicographic powers of totally ordered abelian groups. *Order* 5:275–287, 1988.

[Hon14] Jizhan Hong. Definable Non-divisible Henselian Valuations, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* 46(1):14–18, 2014.

[JK14a] Franziska Jahnke and Jochen Koenigsmann. Definable Henselian Valuations. To appear in *J. Symbolic Logic*, 2014.

[JK14b] Franziska Jahnke and Jochen Koenigsmann. Uniformly defining p-henselian valuations. Manuscript, arXiv:1407.8156, 2014.

[Koe95] Jochen Koenigsmann. p-Henselian Fields. *Manuscripta Mathematica* 87, 1995.

[KP84] Franz-Viktor Kuhlmann and Alexander Prestel. On places of algebraic function fields. *Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik* 353, 1984.

[Mar02] David Marker. *Model Theory: An Introduction*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 217. Springer, 2002.

[Pre91] Alexander Prestel. Algebraic number fields elementarily determined by their absolute Galois group. *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 73(2), 1991.

[Pre14] Alexander Prestel. Definable Henselian Valuation Rings. To appear in *J. Symbolic Logic*, 2014.

[PD11] Alexander Prestel and Charles Delzell. *Mathematical logic and model theory: A brief introduction*. Expanded translation of the 1986 German original. Universitext. Springer, London, 2011.

[PZ78] Alexander Prestel and Martin Ziegler. Model-theoretic methods in the theory of topological fields. *Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik* 299(300), 1978.

[Wei90] Volker Weispfenning. Existential equivalence for Ordered Abelian Groups with Parameters. *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 29, 1990.

Fachbereich Mathematik und Statistik, University of Konstanz, 78457 Konstanz, Germany

E-mail address: arno.fehm@uni-konstanz.de

Institut für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagenforschung, University of Münster, Einsteinstr. 62, 48149 Münster, Germany

E-mail address: franziska.jahnke@wwu.de